rive copies of the WEEKLY,

CITY OF WASHINGTON. WEDNESDAY MORNING. JANUARY 12, 1853.

CONGRESSIONAL.

DEFERRED DEBATE.

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1853

BENAIE.

On the 29th of June, 1850, Sir Henry L. Bulwer gave notice to Mt. Clayton that he was instructed to insist in ratifying the convention on an explanatory declaration that the engagements as to neutral territory did not apply

The honorable senator from Michigan thereupon said that paper disclosed a very extraordinary fact, to wit, that while on its face, and as was understood by the Senate, the convention included British Honduras and its dependencies, it was without the knowledge or consent of the Senate explained by the negotiators at the ratification to exclude them; and that thus, in derogation of the rights of the Senate, the construction of the treaty was changed in a vital point; that in this transaction the executive de partment of General Taylor's administration had committed a great error, unprecedented in diplomacy. And he protested that neither the Senate nor himself in approving understood by the Senate, the convention as it was thus shown to have been understood by the Senate, it would not have received a single vote; and in this protest he included the honorable senator from Alabama, [Mr. Kino.] who at the time was chairman of the Committee on Forsign Relations; and he alleged that that gentleman had told him that he had supposed until that day that the project of accepting the Queen of England's qualification of the construction of the treaty had been abandoned.

Hen the stipulations are already made between the two nations for the construction and maintenance of canals or railway passages across all these routes. But the two nations for the construction and maintenance of canals or railway passages across all these routes. But the two nations for the construction of the two nations for the construction and maintenance of the two nations for the construction and maintenance of the term "Central American States." in the sixth article, is equivalent to and illustrates the meaning of the term "Central American States." in the sixth article, is equivalent to and illustrates the meaning of the term "Central American States." in the sixth article, is equivalent to and illustrates the meaning of the term "Central American States." in the sixth article, is equivalent to and illustrates the convention, in describing the term

sent me as making such a statement.

Mr. SEWARD. I will read from the printed speech of the honorable senator from Ohio to show the opinion of the authority which he quoted. The Senate will then judge whether he has corrected me or himself. That senator said:

the north, which, under the names of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, confederated themselves when they became independent of Spain, and established a republic called the federal republic of Central America. In the convulsions of that region that union has been dissolved, but the name acquired by it still hangs around those States, and they, and they alone, are the States described, politically, in books, geographies, and otherwise, as the States of Central America.

Now, did the convention use the name of Central America in its geographical sense, or did they use it in its political sense? Certainly in its political sense, then it may as well be insisted that the convention embraces all between 7 deg, and 22 deg, of north latitude, as that it embraces all between 7 deg, and 22 deg, of north latitude, and this would be to make it embrace a part of the United States, which would be absurd.

2d. The geographical Central America, whether broad or narrow, embraces the regions which contain the three celebrated passes from ocean to ocean, viz: Panama, Nicaragua, and Tehuantepee; and if that be the sense in which the name Central America is used in the convention, then the stopulations are already made between

Senators who accuse Secretaries of stupidity, or sup-Senators who accuse Secretaries or stupicity, or sup-pression and fraud, cannot be allowed to plead ignorance of official expositions in the official journals. Sixhly and lastly, I shall attempt to convince the sen-ators that they and the Senate did understand that the convention did not include British Honduras when they approved it.

Mr. King, of Alabama, was chairman of the Commit-tee on Egretary Relations, and the arrows medium of com-

Mr. King, of Alabama, was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the proper medium of communication between the Senate and the Secretary of State. The senator from Michigan tells us that Mr. King has stated to him that "after the quest ratification came from England, on the 29th of June, he had an interview with Mr. Clayton, who desired to know whether the treaty ought to be sent back to the Senate for its action on that conditional ratification. The only reason for sending it back to the Senate was that the Senate might have not understood the convention as not including British Honduras, and so might object to the ratification of it, as thus explained by the negotiators. The correspondence between Mr. Clayton and Mr. King tells the result:

that we now pretend that Central America in the treaty in-cludes British Honduras.

I shall therefore say to him, in effect, that such construc-tion was not in the contemplation of the negotiators or the Senate as the time of confirmation. May I have your per-mission to add that the true understanding was applained by you as chairman of Foreign Relations, to the Senate, before the vote was taken on the treaty I I think it due to frankness on our part.

Yes truly, yours,

JOHN M. CLAYTON.

To Hon. W. R. KING, U. S. Senate

July 4, 1850.

My dram str: The Senate perfectly understood that the treaty did not include British Honduras. Frankness becomes our government; but you should be careful not to use any expression which would seem to recognise the right of England to any portion of Honduras.

Faithfully, your obedient servant, W. R. KING.

To Hon. John M. CLAYTON, Secretary of State.

So the proper organ of the Senate reported that they perfectly understood that the convention did not include British Honduras. The accusing senators will not impeach the chairman, and if they do I shall not go with them. I respect and honor that distinguished man—nay, sir, I love him. I have received injuries—many of them here. The memory of them died in the hour in which they were committed. But I have received kindnesses—benefits, too—and many of these were received at the hands of William R. King. Not one of these shall perish in my memory until I give an account of them to his Creator and mine. And now, since those honorable senators have so broadly assumed to speak for us all, they

Significant which constructed by the control of the sales of the claborate arguments which they have made this subject. I have not the means and facilities of arming myself with British authority to defend the rights of British claims, which I should infer, from the very fail knowledge they have passed to them. But I stand here as I shall upon all occasions to defend the position which I shave not the means and facilities of arming myself with notwithstanding the research and the labor bestowed upon this subject to the whole accessible to them. But I stand here as I shall upon all occasions to defend the position which I shave not which I shave not the means and facilities of arming myself with notwithstanding the research and the labor bestowed upon this subject by two of the ablest champions of their party apon this subject to the course which I have already taken. The honorable sensity from New York, in the high-sounding notes of his elequence, has pronounced the assertion that I made, that in all probability this understanding between the British minister and Mr. Clayton was not communicated to the President of the United States, as a wanton asset in the I shall not at the probability this understanding between the British minister and Mr. Clayton was not communicated to the President of the United States, as a wanton asset and the lafternor in the remaining of their probability this understanding between the British minister and Mr. Clayton was not communicated to the President of the United States, as a wanton asset and the lagrages and the the general words, "any part of Central America." In the term central America, in the term central three course which I have already taken. The honorable sensitive was not meant to apply to these several possessions? That was the natural in all probability this understand me, although the defendence in the terms may not be material, and the president of the United States, as a wanton assential tail. I stated to fact. I suggested the what I did say. I said it was wanton

corving the coveration understand it to include all Clayton to the convention until the 6th of January increased. America, as they have now described Central America and their descendants, and therefore, as the United States, and their is an ever recurring confidence on the President transmitted to States, and their is an ever recurring confidence on the President transmitted to Congress a communication, which contained these contained them of the Contral America, employed in the convention, has a double sense, a copyrable and the convention, has a double sense, a copyrable and the convention, as a double sense, as copyrable and the convention, has a double sense, as a copyrable and the convention, as a double sense, as a copyrable and the convention, as a double sense, as a copyrable and the convention, as a double sense as a delty different. America is divided recognishing the sense and a political one, and the sense as a construction, as a double sense as a design different transmitted to contrave the convention of the present transmitted transmitted to contrave the convention of the present transmitted transmitte

and left it to the Senate and to the people to draw their own conclusions.

Mr. SEWARD. If the senator will allow me, as I know he cannot have a desire to misunderstand me, although the difference in the terms may not be material, I will state what I did say. I said it was wantonness of censure, and not a wanton assault.

Mr. DOWNS. I understood the senator to say that I had made a wanton assault upon the Secretary of State was very probable under the circumstances—the sickness and death of the President; and with all the research of both gentlemen, with all the knowledge which they seem to have upon the subject, neither of them has ventured to assert that this identical fact was ever communicated to the President. The senator from Maryland [Mr. Prance] has said that it was communicated to the President, while that senator is so anxious to the cabinet. I repeat that I did not state it as a fact, but as a mere suggestion, prompted by the circumstances with which we are all fauniliar.

But, Mr. Preadent, while that senator is so anxious to charge another senator with an attack of wantonness, he ought to have been very careful that he did not hurback upon himself the very same imputation of making charges against senators here which were full of wantonness. But he has done that very thing, and he did in which we are all fauniliar.

But, Mr. Preadent, while the Secretary of State was known to the Senate. I deny it. Will the gentleman now, upon his word, say in his place that that fact was communicated to him as a senator? He has not stated it yet, and I very much doubt whether he can.

Mr. SEWARD. As the honorable senator appeals to me, which was given to the treaty. With regard to the other, I did not offer myself as a witness to say that the Secretary of State was communicated to him as a senator? He has not stated it yet, and I very much doubt whether he can.

Mr. SEWARD. As the honorable senator appeals to myself it knew this understanding of the construction which was given to the treaty. With regard to the ot

is year. He British minister and the Secretary of State was known to the Senate. I deny it. Will the geutleman now, upon his word, say in his place that that fact was communicated to him as a senator? He has not stated the other day, that in regard to give the present of the South the complete was a simple of the comple

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS The name of no person will be entered upon our books, un

loss of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be re-

Mr. CHASE. What book is that?
Mr. PEARCE. It is Executive Document, volume
0, 1849 and 1850.
Mr. CASS. That is the standing form of the commission—a de facto acknowledgment.

Mr. PEARCE. Precisely. It was a de facto acknowledgment of the authority of the British government to grant an exequatur, and therefore an acknowledgment

grant an exequator, and therefore an acknowledgment of her jurisdiction de facto.

Mr CASN. I would ask the senator if he supposes that the same form was not used in regard to the Mexican and South American provinces before their independence was acknowledged, and also in regard to Greece? It is a de facto acknowledgment of the state of things, without conceding the right at all. It is not a diplomatic recognition.

Mr PEARCE. That is all Mr. Clayton has done. He has recognised the de facto existence of the British authority within those limits. The exequator in this case was from the British government. Here is the letter of Mr. Hempstead informing the Secretary of State that he had received it:

That is what was done in that day, which it seems